The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

VOL. XIV. OCTOBER 15, 1948 TISHRI 12, 5709 No. 1

- ***"DUAL LOYALTY" — A NEW APPROACH***

  by Ira Eisenstein

- ***THE HISTORICAL MOSES***

  by Immanuel Lewy

- ***UNETANNEH TOKEF***

  by Frieda Clark Hyman

- ***REINTERPRETING PROTESTANT DOCTRINE IN JUSTICE TO THE JEWS (A Review)***

  by Karl M. Chworowsky

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $3.00 per year; 15¢ per copy; foreign 25¢ extra; membership in the Foundationn, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**
Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**
Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Roland B. Gittelsohn, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Will Herberg, Aharon Kessler, Immanuel Lewy, Edward T. Sandrow, Leo Shapiro, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Morris Adler, Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfied, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Jack J. Cohen, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Samuel Dinin, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Samuel C. Kohs, Milton Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Sidney Morgenbesser, Maurice Pekarsky, David Polish, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Max Weine, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Executive Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY is minister of the Flatbush Unitarian Church. His articles and essays have appeared in many American periodicals.

FRIEDA CLARK HYMAN has frequently contributed to THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST and other Anglo-Jewish publications.

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION
announces the publication
of a new brochure
THE RELIGION OF THE JEWISH PRAYER BOOK
by JACK J. COHEN

containing chapters on:

History of Jewish Prayer

The Challenge to Prayer

Theology of the Traditional Prayer Book

A Reconstructionist Approach to Prayer

Designed for the use of study and discussion groups.
Suitable for Individual readnig and study.

Prices: $1.00 per copy. 90 cents per copy to Foundation members and in quantity orders of ten or more.

Combination offer with the Sabbath Prayer Book, $2.75.
(Prayer Book sells for $2.00)

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of The Religion of the Jewish Prayer Book.

Please send me ..... copies of the Sabbath Prayer Book and the Religion of the Jewish Prayer Book.

Check for $———— is enclosed

Name .....

Address .....

The RECONSTRUCTIONIST

Vol. XIV. October 15, 1948 TISHRI 12, 5709 No. 12

EDITORIALS

FOR RATIONAL CONSIDERATION OF THE BERNADOTTE REPORT

AGAIN the problem of Palestine is before the Assembly of the United Nations for "final" settlement. We hope that this time the settlement will really be final—at least to the extent that any human settlement can be. It is of utmost importance not only to Israel but to the entire Near East, and, indeed, to the peace of the world that both Israel and its Arab neighbors be enabled to settle down to constructive peaceful work. But no settlement can be final unless its terms are based on a fair consideration of all the legitimate interests involved.

The prospects of such a settlement are much better at the moment of our going to press than they were when the Assembly sessions opened. At that time there was grave danger that elements hostile to Israel would force the hasty adoption of the Bernadotte Report in its entirety, although it contains provisions that are less than fair to Israel and although Bernadotte himself had regarded it merely as a basis for discussion. Foreign Minister Bevin and the British Foriegn Office were quick to make capital of the deplorable assassination of Count Bernadotte, and in this they were abetted by our own State Department. Their hope was apparently that the bitter resentment over the crime against the UN mediator and the sentimental desire to honor his memory by adopting his plan would lead to an uncritical acceptance of all his recommendations. Moreover, by putting the Palestine problem as the first item on the agenda, they could take advantage of the impatience of the delegates to come to grips with the problems of the atomic bomb, and other issues involved in the East-West conflict. The decision to give the Palestine question a later place on the Assembly agenda has, fortunately, changed the situation. The Bernadotte Report can now be considered in an atmosphere less charged with emotion and more favorable to rational judgment.

It is well that we Jews, too, should give the Bernadotte report our most earnest consideration. It is evident that the Israeli statesmen are taking it very seriously. Some Jewish arm-chair strategists may be disposed to criticize them for even consenting to discuss any deviations from the original partition resolutions. We believe, however, that the stand taken by Israel is by far the wiser one. The original partition plan was predicated on the assumption that, once the Assembly adopted the plan, it would either be accepted by the Arab states or be imposed upon them. Neither happened, and

there is little likelihood of any plan being enforceable which does not take into account the vital interests not only of Israel but of all nations that have an important stake in the ultimate issue. What those interests are, and what detailed concessions to some of those interests Israel can prudently make, we must leave to the statesmen of Israel to decide.

There are, however, certain limits beyond which Jewish statesmanship cannot go without jeopardizing the interests of the Jewish people as a whole. A viable Jewish state must arise out of the decision, one capable of absorbing an immigration of all those Jews who feel an imperative need to settle in the Jewish national home. The state, moreover, must be able to afford security to its people and must possess resources adequate for their economic prosperity.

In the light of these demands, let us now assess the terms of the Bernadotte Report. The following are, in brief, the principal provisions, though not stated in the order in which they appear in the published conclusions of his report. The most important provision is the insistence, in defiance of the Arab states and of the original stand of Great Britain, that the state of Israel should be recognized as existing and entitled to continue. Another provision calls for the internationalization of Jerusalem, as under the original partition plan, but "with maximum feasible local autonomy for its Arab and Jewish communities." A third asks that Haifa be made a free port under the state of Israel and Lydda a free port under the Arab state. A fourth proposes the surrender of the Negev to the Arab state and cession of all Western Galilee to Israel. A fifth states that the Arab part of Palestine need not be made an independent state but might be given to Trans-Jordan or divided between it and other Arab states. A sixth provides for the repatriation of displaced Arabs and Jews.

The acceptance by Great Britain of the Bernadotte report in spite of its including recognition of the state of Israel marks a great triumph. Bevin did not want to recognize Jewish statehood. He had done his best to impose on the Yishuv the status of a ghetto in an Arab state. He did not succeed and has been compelled to register his failure. This immeasurably enhances Israeli prestige and will ultimately compel the Arab states to deal directly with the state of Israel. The recognition of its statehood gives to Israel an oportunity to win by negotiation advantages that it could not obtain by mere petition; it puts Israel in a position where it can confer favors as well as ask them.

But the state must be a "viable" state; it must have room not merely for its present population but for the anticipated mass immigration. The recognition of this need was what impelled the UN to assign the Negev to Israel under the partition plan adopted by the preceding Assembly. The same argument still holds. The cession of Western Galilee, a matter of 400 square miles, is not compensation for the surrender of the Negev's 3,075 square miles. That is not to say that Israel may not make some concession in this region to Trans-Jordan, or, what amounts to the same thing, to British interests. But Israel should at least be permitted to retain the greater part of the Negev, particularly the northern half with its twenty-one Jewish settlements and with its access to the resources of the Dead Sea that play so large a part in the Israeli economy.

As to the internationalization of Jerusalem—Israel had accepted that in principle under the original partition plan and it probably will not oppose it even now. But events have shown the need for certain qualifying safeguards as con-

ditions to acceptance. In spite of insisting on the internationalization of Jerusalem, the UN did nothing to prevent the Arab states from laying siege to the city. At one time the late Count Bernadotte had even advocated ceding it to Trans-Jordan. It is important, therefore, that the 95,000 Jews who live in Jerusalem be assured of self-government and the power to protect their persons and property and their civil rights, even under an international regime. With this in view, they should be given citizenship in Israel.

However, the geographical situation of Jerusalem made it, under the original partition scheme, an enclave in an Arab state. The result was that the Arabs were able to besiege it and cut off its water supply and its communication with the Jews of Israel. That situation calls for a territorial readjustment which would give to Israel a secure corridor connecting it with the Jewish section of Jerusalem.

As for making Haifa and Lydda free ports—there can be no objection to that on principle, but great care will have to be taken in determining the exact meaning of the term and the concrete measures for implementing freedom of the two ports.

With what happens to the Arab part of Palestine, we are not concerned so long as the state which governs it shall be required to recognize Israel as a condition of its own recognition, and shall be acceptable to the native population. Similarly the problem of repatriation of displaced Arabs and Jews can probably be negotiated, once the Arab states recognize Israel.

With the foregoing qualifications, it seems to us that the Bernadotte proposals might well be accepted by Israel. If there is the will to arrive at a settlement of the issue at the present Assembly, a reasonable adjustment of interests along these lines should ensue.

PLANLESS GENEROSITY

IT has become a commonplace to say that the establishment of the Jewish state confronts American Jews with an unprecedented situation. Problems have arisen that Jews have not had to face for two millenia. We are not referring, however, to the much debated, hotly contested, still-to-be determined questions: the relationship of the State of Israel to the Jews of other countries, or the corollary proposition, the future of Judaism outside of Eretz Yisrael.

We are considering the unprecedented needs of the state of Israel and the unexampled scale of giving by Jews in the Diaspora. Eretz Yisrael needs funds for absorbing immigrants, for its social and economic development, for its health, medical and educational requirements, for its security and defense. For much of these necessary monies the state is dependent upon Jews abroad and must have their good will and moral support.

For the first time in our long history, these material needs are matched by the willingness of Jews everywhere to give. This desire to share in the great adventure of upbuilding the Jewish state, to rescue Jews from the dangers that threaten them in European and Oriental countries, and to demonstrate the faith and pride which all Jews feel for the accomplishments and achievements of the Israelis seems to be boundless.

This willingness to bestow every possible benefit upon Eretz Yisrael and its people is responsible for the countless appeals now being made in behalf of Israel. A new cause crops up almost daily. An organization with an unfamiliar name appears. It makes its appeal in the press, on street-corners, on the platform,

over the radio, from the sound truck. A charity box is placed in stores, in restaurants, even in motion picture theatre lobbies. All urge help for the Jewish state. The spirit is ever so willing, but the coordination is weak.

Most of the organizations making collections for Israel are legitimate. They are aiding the Israelis. They raise funds for medical supplies, for food, for ambulances, for blood plasma banks. They gather clothing, uniforms for the Jewish army, layettes for new-born babies, and even office furniture. They make their plea to the conscience of Jews, and it is a heartening spectacle indeed to see the generous and selfless response.

Nevertheless, the existence of such numerous organizations making varied appeals causes much confusion. Their efforts overlap. Organizations that for many years have engaged in programs of practical assistance and constructive efforts for the rebuilding of Eretz Yisrael may be injured by these temporary emergency drives. These bodies, and it is needless to name them, established standards for building and giving in the dark days before the Jewish state became a reality.

There is danger, also, that this selfless outpouring of giving may be dissipated. Contributors, eager to help, may in time, become disillusioned with the multiplicity of drives and may vent their dissatisfaction on those very causes that are indispensable to the Jewish state.

We urge that an officially recognized and authorized agency take this matter in hand. Perhaps the American Section of the World Zionist Executive, which has been vested with certain economic powers by the Actions Committee is that body. A list of organizations making legitimate appeals for Israel should be prepared and made available to the American Jewish community. This list should include a description of the functions of each organization, the extent to which each engages in activity in Eretz Yisrael, the scope of its program. The list should also disclose which organizations serve special interests and which serve the country as a whole. Thus the public will be able better to gauge to which organization it wishes to contribute, and to what extent the claims made by each in publicity releases and in propaganda statements are legitimate, exaggerated or plain misrepresentations.

The present confusion arising out of the multiplicity and duplication should be ended. The needs of Eretz Yisrael must be satisfied. And the humane spirit of generous sharing now permeating the American Jewish community must be directed into the most effective channels.

TOWARDS AN OPEN WORLD

FIVE important Jewish organizations — the American Jewish Committee, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, the Jewish Labor Committee, the United Service for New Americans and the Synagogue Council of America—are appealing to Congress for the liberalization of our immigration laws. Their request is a very modest one. They do not ask for the abolition of the quota system. All they ask is that the existing quota system be made more flexible by permitting the carrying over of unused quotas from year to year; that the carry-over restrictions of the law be modified to permit the establishment of a pool of the unused quotas without regard to national origin; and that every trace of racial discrimination be eliminated from the immigration laws. These suggestions, the appeal rightly points out, are thoroughly in line with American interests and principles.

Yet despite the modesty of these demands and their obvious conformity with American principles, it may be predicted

that the sponsors of these reforms are not going to have an easy time of it convincing Congress. We know this, we take it for granted; yet it would be well to pause a moment to realize the full significance of this fact.

Who of us today recalls—from memory or reading—the incredible days before the first World War, not more than one generation ago, when men could move about the face of the globe almost at will? In 1912, no passports were needed for any but such backward countries as Russia, Turkey or China. Restrictions on immigration were quite insignificant, hardly more than a few necessary regulations for the protection of health and public order. For nearly two centuries the world had been advancing towards the goal of an open world in which men could travel, settle and live at will, and by 1912 the goal was almost in sight. Then came the war.

The two wars and the inter-war period, which was hardly more than a truce, changed the face of the civilized world. Within a decade, the very nearly "one world" of 1912 was transformed into a world broken into jagged fragments, into an aggregation of fear-driven national states, each determined on barring and bolting its doors against the inhabitants of all the rest of the earth. In this nationalist madness, the United States set the pace. Already in 1882, Chinese "coolies" had been excluded from entry, though not on avowedly racist grounds. It was the first World War that broke down the traditional policy of a free America. A quota law, based on the obvious racist principle of "nationality" was passed in 1921 and was rendered even more restrictive in 1924 and 1927. Other nations were not far behind; the totalitarian states, indeed, not only sealed their frontiers against the outside world but made it impossible for anyone to travel from one town to another even within their borders without permission from the police. And so, when catastrophe struck in 1939, suddenly creating vast armies of homeless refugees, the Displaced Persons Camp—something utterly unthinkable in civilized Europe half a century before—was the best we could do.

This is the world as we have made it in the course of the past generation. And this is the world we have come into the habit of regarding as *normal* and *natural*. The breakdown of our liberal culture has reached the point where even the memory of the world as it was only forty years ago has all but disappeared. Freedom of movement over the surface of the earth —something almost achieved in 1912— has become in our thinking, if we do think of it at all, an absurdly utopian ideal.

This must not be. For if we accept the frightful, hatred-obsessed world of today as normal, we are lost. It is *not* normal and must never be permitted to become so. Through all the horror and darkness, we must never abandon the faith that the normal life of man—the life for which he was created—is a life of peace, brotherhood and justice, and that it *is* possible for men to achieve a measure of decency in their relations. Let us never forget that the world we live in is literally mad, even if judged by the very modest standard of what mankind had attained a little more than a generation ago.

Let us never forget this. Let us keep it in mind especially when we work for the liberalization of the immigration laws as advocated by the Jewish organizations above mentioned. Let us by all means do all we can to liberalize the existing immigration laws; they need it badly, for they are indeed laws conceived in the anti-democratic, anti-humanist spirit of racism and exclusion. But let us keep in mind that, whatever the outcome of the present effort, we must never rest

until we have again achieved the goal that seemed already realized in 1912—an open world, about which man, enjoying his rights as a human being, would be able to move at will.

REALITIES AND VALUES

THE HORROR WITH WHICH the Jewish as well as the Gentile world responded to the report of Bernadotte's assassination has had one good effect: it has strengthened the authority of the government of Israel in its fight against dissident terrorist groups. The Irgun has submitted to that authority and placed its arms and its personnel at the disposal of the state. The Stern group leaders are being rounded up.

The American organizations that have been raising funds for the terrorists are being dissolved. The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation which had supported the Irgun decided to liquidate and has turned over its headquarters in Washington to the use of the Government of Israel. The American Friends of the Fighters for Freedom (the Sternists) has also announced its dissolution.

This greatly reduces the danger of civil strife as a result of clashing ideologies.

▼

IN ISRAEL CULTURE AND AGRICULTURE often go together.

The September 17 issue of the *National Jewish Post* contains an interesting account of a projected artists' colony to be known as Bet Aman (Home of the Artist). The settlers are to devote five hours a day to work on the farm, which they will maintain on a subsistence basis; their only "commercial crop" will be the art products which they will put on the market and to the creation of which the remainder of their day will be devoted.

The nucleus of the colony in America is a group of twenty artists who have acquired a home of their own in Jamaica, Long Island, where they live and work together on their art, until they will be ready to settle. Others who will join the colony include Israelis, a Canadian, a Belgian, a German, and a Cuban.

The only previous attempt to establish a permanent artists' colony, according to the *Post,* was that made by Van Gogh and Gaugin in France toward the end of the last century. It did not succeed. But these Jewish artists are confident that their attempt will. So are we; the motive of cooperating in the building of Israel will make the difference.

▼

MICHAEL A. STAVITSKY, PRESident of the American Association for Jewish Education, has announced that, during the past school year, 232,348 children were enrolled in all Jewish religious schools, marking an increase of 2.1 percent over the previous year's enrollment.

That is good, but it is not good enough. It is encouraging to note that the number of children getting a religious education is increasing rather than diminishing. But the re-Judaizing of American Jewry must proceed at a much more rapid pace, if Judaism is to win its race with the assimilationist tendencies generated by the non-Jewish environment.

Nevertheless, it is good to note a gain. It shows that we are not living merely by the momentum of the past. Progress is being made, and, although it is slow, the law of acceleration will apply to it, if our educational efforts are not relaxed.

▼

A POLITICAL CAMPAIGN OFFERS excellent opportunity for the spread of all sorts of hate propaganda. The National Community Relations Advisory Council does well, therefore, to warn the Jewish community to keep on the lookout for any manifestations of racial or religious prejudice in the campaigns.

It has, of course, requested and received from the chairmen of the national campaign committees of both major parties assurances that they would discountenance any anti-Semitic utterances in their party propaganda.

If, in spite of these precautions, any incidents of hate-mongering occur in your community, just inform the NCRAC, and it will take the appropriate action to suppress the nefarious agitation.

▼

A PROPOS OF OUR EDITORIAL "Toward an Open World" in this issue, we call attention here to the need of doing all in our power to make possible the admission of Jewish DPs to the United States despite the difficulties set up by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

According to that Act, no DP can be admitted unless (1) a job at prevailing wages is guaranteed for him, (2) safe and sanitary housing can be provided without displacing another person, (3) transportation from the port of debarkation to the place of employment be provided, and (4) the immigrant will not become a charge on public funds.

The United Service for New Americans, Inc. is occupying itself with the problem. It is mainly responsible for the national planning involved. But congregations throughout the country have been asked to list opportunities for employing DPs. Lists of DPs with specialized skills are available. If you know of a job that a DP could fill, get in touch with your local rabbi or with the USNA, 15 Park Row, New York 7, N. Y.

▼

AN IMPORTANT QUESTION involving the civil rights of religious Jews is up for decision by the Superior Court of Pennsylvania.

A Jewish woman who refused to accept a job requiring her to work on the Sabbath was denied unemployment compensation by a decision of the State Unemployment Compensation Board of Review.

The American Jewish Congress has appealed from this decision. It points out correctly that this case has important implications for Christians as well as Jews, "since under the present ruling a person who, for religious reasons, refused Sunday work would be unable to receive unemployment compensation."

REPENTANCE WTH JOY

It was the holy way of the righteous Rabbi Meir of Apt (19th Century) to kindle the hearts of Israel with extreme joy for the service of the Name of God. One Kol Nidre night many people were assembled in the House of Prayer. The rabbi entered the House of Prayer and said with great excitement, "Jews, let us appease our Holy Torah whom we have dishonored all year by not fulfilling the commandments which are written in it." At once all the people were so struck by his words that they burst into weeping which lasted for two hours.

As soon as the rabbi, of blessed memory, had said these words he went home. After two hours he returned to the House of Prayer and saw that they were all weeping. He cried, "Jews, this is not what I desired; I wish you to turn to God in joy." And he began to chant the hymn, "Majesty and faithfulness are His who lives forever," with such enthusiasm and pleasure that they all stopped crying and took one another by the hand and danced for an hour in a great circle. Then they began Kol Nidre. (Kehal Hasidim heHadash)

S. Y. AGNON, *Days of Awe,* published by Schocken Books, New York

"Dual Loyalty" — A New Approach

By IRA EISENSTEIN

AT the recent Actions Committee meeting, the internal affairs of Israel were removed from the jurisdiction of the World Zionist Organization. With this step, the Jewish Agency entered upon a new phase in its interesting career. This is an appropriate time, therefore, to comment upon the extraordinary character of the Jewish Agency, and of the movement as a whole which it was designed to advance. The era which witnessed the rise and the fulfillment of the Zionist political movement has been an era of ever intensified nationalism. So much the more noteworthy is the unique character of Zionism. Almost inadvertently, the nations of the world produced a new concept when they recognized as valid the Jewish aspiration to restore the Jewish State.

The new concept might be called "ethical internationalism" or, more accurately, "transnationalism," since it is not confined to the interrelationship of nations but is applied more broadly to relations that cross national boundaries. Because it is so new, it aroused suspicion and fear. Truth to tell, most of the fear was experienced by timid Jewish anti-Zionists, and the suspicion felt only by scattered Jew-haters who would suspect anything Jews did, no matter how innocuous. But the fact remains that the charge of "dual loyalty" has been raised, and charges do not die easily. Unless the new concept is clearly understood, the charges will be repeated even by well-wishers.

The Problem in Terms of Multiple Interests

The extent of the failure to grasp what is involved in the concept of ethical transnationalism may be judged by the very phrasing of the problem in terms of "loyalty." To judge by the yardstick of loyalty is a habit of mind, a habit characteristic of those who, consciously or unconsciously, ascribe primacy in human relations to the state. The very democrats who are usually so vehement in their denunciation of the totalitarian state, and who contend that the state exists for the individual, and not the individual for the state, accept, by implication, the apotheosis of the state when they judge a movement by its effect upon loyalty. If they were, indeed, concerned primarily with the individual and his pursuit of happiness, they would approach the problem of Zionism from an altogether different angle.

When we begin with the individual and work out from him, so to speak, we operate with another vocabulary. We do not speak of loyalties, but of "interests," and we must ask, "What are the interests of a human being, which arise out of his need to fulfill himself? Should the individual confine himself to one interest, or may he enjoy multiple interests?" The answer generally given to the question put in this way is that the person with multiple interests is more cultured, more useful to himself and to the world. The person who is interested in his family, his community, his profession and his church is more highly developed, and more likely to achieve a healthy perspective on each of those interests. The narrow-minded individual tends to become preoccupied with a very limited number of interests, or concerns. His tastes are not as catholic, and his perceptions are not as keen as those of the person who

experiences a wide range of needs and seeks to satisfy those needs in a large varity of activities and relationships.

It is always possible, that one of the interests may conflict with another. This is bound to happen even when they are limited to two. (Shall he spend the money on a gift for his wife, whom he loves, or shall he buy himself a new hat?). If we assume that we are dealing with an ethical person as well as with an intelligent one, we may also assume that he will resolve any conflict in accordance with what he considers to be the best interests of truth and the general welfare; but it does not occur to us to deny him the right to hold multiple interests.

In the larger area of social questions, he may sometimes have to choose between merely peripheral interests. On other occasions, he may be confronted with the unpleasant task of choosing between more central interests, such as interest in the state and interest in a church. In that case, he should judge by one basic criterion: does one of his central interests so possess him as to rule out the legitimacy of any possible rivals, or is there a higher law to which all his interests are subjected? If every conflict is, *ipso facto,* an illegitimate conflict, then he has in reality only one interest; all others become merely satellites to the one.

If no one interest is sacrosanct, and all must submit equally to the rule of the higher law, then the multiple interests are wholesome and valuable. Supreme loyalty, therefore, does not apply to any one interest, but to the higher law to which all interests are subject. From this point of view, the question of loyalty also enters—but it enters on different grounds, and it is answered differently. Multiple interests are accepted as desirable; the problem of loyalties enters only when conflict occurs. The conflict must then be resolved on the basis of ethical considerations.

Communist Transnationalism

Modern nationalism has tended to approach all the interests of the individual only from the point of view of the single interest, the state. Modern statism has carried this approach to the final stage, namely, that in which all interests must be controlled by the state, for they are always potentially in conflict with it. It is this attitude of the state to all other interests which is responsible for totalitarianism of all kinds, fascist and communist. In the largest and most significant totalitarian state of today, Soviet Russia, musicians, artists, dramatists, and even scientists must conform to the ideology of the state.

Communist statism cannot be understood, however, unless it is observed in context. This is statism to end all statism. It is a nationalism dedicated to transnationalism—of a dangerous kind. The internationalism which communism represents is a worldwide effort to conquer the world. To put it euphemistically, communists want to unite the world. Actually they want it united under the suzerainty of communism. While theoretically, therefore, communism represents transnationalism, as opposed to nationalism, the communist state creates the same conflicts in its citizens as do all nationalisms. The family, the church, the people, the class—all these interests are regarded as illegitimate to the extent that they are set up as rivals of the state. For those living outside Russia, loyalty to their respective states must be subordinate to loyalty to *the* State, Russia. The central interest is expected at all times to take precedence over all other interests.

To speak of a higher law to which the state should be subjected is likely to

evoke either wrath or ridicule. Communists rarely refer to higher laws, except to accuse those who believe in them of seeking to betray the revolution. Stalin is their law, and that is as high as they care to go—or dare to go.

Catholic Transnationalism

The assumptions of modern nationalism are challenged by another form of transnationalism, namely, Catholicism. Catholicism has maintained that man has a legitimate interest which transcends the state, and that is the salvation of his own soul. We must render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's; but if Caesar wants more than belongs to him, if he wants what is God's, he should not have it. For no mortal institution may be considered a legitimate rival of the eternal soul. Supreme loyalty must go to the instrument of divine salvation. Nation, class, profession and family are all peripheral interests. The central interest is God's will.

In order for man to achieve the salvation of his soul, he must function through the Church. That Church is catholic, or universal, and extends beyond the boundaries of any existing state. The relations of a person to the church represent his central interests.

When a coinflict occurs between a man's church interests and any other, he is expected to decide in favor of the church. In effect then, he has only one interest. The "higher law" to which he might submit a conflict is itself identified with and hence decided by his sole interest, the Church. The Catholic person cannot legitimately have multiple interests.

Zionist Transnationalism

The remarkable fact about Zionism has been that, while it has presented itself to the world as a modern nationalism, it has functioned through agencies which negate all the evils of monism, while those movements and institutions like Communism and Catholicism, which ostensibly challenge modern nationalism, exemplify the evils of that nationalism.

Zionism, in the first place, has been a movement of transnational, but not of universal proportions. That is to say, while those who have sought to advance the cause come from many different national states, Zionism has never offered itself as the source of salvation for all people. Zionism has been world-wide, but not catholic.

But even for Zionists themselves, the movement has never been totalitarian. Zionism has never demanded of its adherents an absolute loyalty. To that extent, it has been an ethical transnationalism. American Zionists, for example, have participated in all efforts to rescue the survivors of Nazism, and to bring them to Eretz Yisrael. When the American Government failed to take adequate steps to achieve this humanitarian goal, American Zionists criticized the American Government. Contrariwise, when terrorists take innocent lives, when gangsterism breaks out in Eretz Yisrael, American Zionists protest with vehemence.

While it is true that there have been Zionists who have made the establishment of the Jewish state in the whole of Palestine the sole group interest of Jews, and have refused to recognize any higher law that might conflict with their methods of satisfying that interest, these Zionists not only have not been typical, their attitude definitely derives from other sources and other influences. There is no necessary connection between their Zionism and their fanaticism.

Zionists could afford to subject their movement to ethical standards because they recognized that this movement could not come into being at all except for the recognition by the nations of the world of its inherently ethical character. Zion-

ists alone had neither the power—nor the inclination—to impose Zionism upon Palestine. They wanted international sanction. Indeed, Theodor Herzl spent the short life he lived almost solely in the attempt to obtain a *charter* for establishing a Jewish homeland in Palestine. While it is true that before the Balfour Declaration, in 1917, settlements were already being founded, and land was being purchased, the movement became a transnational movement of magnitude only when the nations of the world gave to the Jews of the world the opportunity to rebuild their national home in Palestine.

From the very beginning, therefore, Zionists, acting upon the rights which the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate granted them, were prepared to permit the organized conscience of the world to judge the merit of their deeds. The Jewish Agency was always ready to report to the British government, and through it to the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations. The Zionist movement never resorted to unilateral action, until, immediately after the war, Great Britain, acting illegally and inhumanly, prevented immigrants from entering the land. Yet, even then, when Great Britain asked the Assembly of the United Nations to investigate the Zionist question, the Zionists immediately agreed to cooperate.

Somehow, the government of Great Britain in 1917, and, subsequently, the statesmen of the nations who formulated the Mandate, recognized intuitively that the nationalism represented by the Zionist movement was in reality an ethical, and responsible, transnationalism. This is evident from the fact that, already in the Balfour Declaration, the participation of the Jews of *all* lands in the Zionist movement was accepted as natural and normal. The Declaration was addressed to Lord Rothschild, who was asked to "bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation," an organization of English Jews. The Declaration favored the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people, "it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice . . . the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country." Thus the British government recognized the right of Jews throughout the world to add the Zionist interest to their other interests. The Mandate incorporated the Balfour Declaration into its preamble.

But the Mandate provided, in addition, (Article Four) for the recognition of "an appropriate Jewish agency . . . as a public body for the purpose of advising and cooperating with the Administration of Palestine . . . and to assist and take part in the development of the country." The nations of the world which approved this document were certainly aware of the fact that such a Jewish Agency would consist, almost wholly, of Jews living in various states throughout the world. Yet they were prepared to deal with such an agency, because the transnationalism that it implied was an ethical one, subject, in the final analysis, to the judgment of the conscience of the world.

In a very real sense, therefore, Zionism was, from the start, an experiment in human cooperation, a test of the capacity of men to transcend the limitations of their national interest.

Now the Jewish state of Israel has come into being and the world will have an opportunity to test whether the faith placed in the Jews of the world has been justified. Jews throughout the world will continue to maintain their interest in Israel. Culturally, spiritually they will forge ever stronger bonds to the land and its people. Diaspora Jewry will have multiple interests, their own national homes and the center of Jewish civiliza-

tion. Israelis, for their part, will continue to concern themselves with the Jews of the diaspora. We must exert every effort to see to it that for Israel, in its relations to its citizens as well as to its sympathizers everywhere, the security and the power of the state shall not be the sole higher law.

If the history of the new state is an augury of its future, we may rest assured that the state of Israel will remain the center of an ethical transnationalism.

UNETANNEH TOKEF

By FRIEDA CLARK HYMAN

Oh shall I shudder with the angel hosts
Before Thy awful judgment seat? See
The words of doom are written on the posts
And pillars of my days; a pedigree
Of suffering is bred within my bone.

Yet when I knelt within the templed walls
And saw the haggard priest ascend alone
Unto the shittim-ark, or in my halls
Of exiled gloom and splendor-circling earth
I heard one pleading voice arise before
Thy throne, I knew the cycle of my birth
And death was crowned with thorns.

I'll not implore
A different fate. Enough that I may sing
Unto a living everlasting King.

DISCOURAGEMENTS AND HOPES OF A BILUI PHYSICIAN

But occasionally there is some satisfaction. There are glimpsed flashes of hope which vanish, only to reappear. They captivate the heart and deceive the eyes like will-o'-the-wisps. Yet in spite of that, what is left to us but these hopes of ours? I no longer have any longing for Russia, while Europe appears so cold, so alien. And here, you are, as it were, at home to some extent. If only there were a little more order and less fever, and if it were not for the villainy of the local administration, matters would gradually improve. There are real Jewish workers here, there are Jewish Bedouins, there are even Jewish robbers, and there are Jews who are not afraid of the Bedouins. You can find a Jew who is a fellah (peasant) and a Jew who is a vintner. But everything is still in a state of chaos, and we shall still have to struggle a very great deal.

From a letter by Dr. Hillel Jaffe, Zichron Yaakov—1894, quoted in KURT WILHELM'S *Roads to Zion,* published by Schocken Library, New York.

The Historical Moses

By IMMANUEL LEWY

THE compiler or redactor of the Pentateuch holds that all the laws recorded in that book were laws given by God to Moses. He nowhere says that *all* these laws were written down by Moses himself. He does mention that *some* of these laws were written down by Moses (Ex: 24.34). Of the stories, he only ascribes to Moses an itinerary of the camping places of Israel in the wilderness (Nu: 33), a song (Dt: 31) and a story of the battle between Amalek and Israel (Ex: 17).

Painstaking biblical researches by serious scholars of different nationalities, outlooks and religious denominations have ascertained that the Pentateuch contains the Israelitic laws not of a single brief period in history, but of all the periods from Moses to Ezra. There may be controversies about the dating of the various codes or groups of laws, but all honest and unbiased critical scholars agree that neither the origin nor the formulation of laws varying to such a degree can be the work of one period. In attributing all these laws to Moses, the compiler of the Pentateuch must have meant that all the laws accepted by the authoritative leaders of Israel had the same sanctity as those which had been given by God to Israel in the days of Moses.

We have no reason to suppose that Moses wrote more stories than the compiler assumed. Nor have we reason to doubt that he wrote down some laws, an itinerary, a battle-record and a song—not that of Dt: 32, but another.

There is much evidence for the assumption that the basic document of the Pentateuchal stories was written down in the age of the early monarchy by a great historian, able story-teller and wise teacher, presumably by the prophet Nathan. The sympathetic figure of Moses and the chief events of his life would then be the reconstruction of an old and remote past by the re-creative spirit of a national genius. He evidently used old traditions, but selected and expressed them in accordance with his own vision. To discover the real Moses, we must look for records dating from the time of Moses himself. Fortunately we have some laws which were apparently formulated by him. They are embedded in the First Code (Ex: 21-23). Here they are:

"Whoever strikes a man dead must die. Whoever strikes his father and mother must die. Whoever steals a man and sells him must die. Whoever curses his father and mother must die. Whoever lies with a beast must die. Whoever sacrifices to other gods than YHWH must die. Life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."

These apodictic and laconic laws are so distinct from all the other casuistic laws in style, outlook and terseness that they can only be explained as representing the older laws of Israel. The civil code has many similarities with other contemporary codes, the Babylonian, Hittite and Assyrian. When Israel settled in Canaan, it adopted to a great extent the civilization of the country. But in some important respects Israel preserved its own character. The Israelites could not accept the commercializing of justice. They could not tolerate that the poor should suffer retaliative mutilation whereas the rich might escape by paying fines. Therefore they went back to the old apodictic laws of Moses which demanded

undiscriminating retaliation as representing greater equality and justice.

What kind of personality looms from these old laws?

Moses was a genius of simplicity and rationality. His goal was: one nation, one God, one law. Therefore he stood for:

1) Equality of individual rights—no difference in criminal law between man and woman, noble or common, rich or poor, master or slave.

2) Personal freedom. To steal a man and sell him was a deadly sin. Israel was delivered from bondage never again to be enslaved (see the logical development of this idea in Ex: 21,6 and Lev: 25,42).

3) Retaliative justice. Punishment must be like the offense, neither greater nor less. Cruelty can only be prevented by fear of an equally cruel response. Therefore the record of Amalek's battle, with the admonition: Do not forget! The finer problems of motivation were disregarded.

4) Authority of the older generation. Parents had a privilege. To hurt them by word or deed did not result in punishment equal to the offense, but in death. The problem of motivation was disregarded again.

5) Violence between man and man must be eradicated by strict retaliation.

6) Naturalness in sex relations. Cohabitation with beasts is a man-degrading act and must be eradicated.

7) Only the worship of YHWH is allowed. The Israelitic tribes must have only one God to become one nation.

The YHWH of Moses was a God of justice, equality, freedom, authority and naturalness. Freedom must be restricted by justice, equality by parental authority and naturalness by non-violence between man and man. His concepts of God and man were more rational than mystical, more social than metaphysical, more ethical than cultic, and more volitional than sentimental.

This characterization of Moses' concept of God is in full harmony with his great historical achievement, the liberation and unification of the tribes of Israel. There is no doubt that Moses identified himself with his enslaved people in the hour of its greatest crisis. The degradation of free nomadic tribes by a brutal state offended Moses' love of freedom and justice. When still a young man he made up his mind to deliver his people. At first he may have believed that violence must be overcome by counter-violence. So he killed an Egyptian officer who had slain a Hebrew. Soon he realized that this course was not practical and would only end in his being arrested and killed. Therefore he fled to the wilderness of Midian, where he came into contact with a leading priest. What happened during the exile of Moses we do not know. One fact is clear: He went back to Egypt with a new program in his mind. He wanted to avoid bloodshed and tried to win the Egyptian authorities through negotiation. It may be that some unusual events, such as heavy hailstorms, a cattle-plague, a darkness produced by huge swarms of locusts, a children's epidemic and other national calamities had enabled some tribes to escape from bondage into the wilderness. Moses remained till the last groups were driven out by the Egyptians themselves. After the wonderful escape at the Red Sea he gathered all the scattered tribes of Israel and welded them together into one nation, giving them an organization and laws governing their social and ritual behavior.

Moses had not the intention of founding a new religion. He spoke in the name

of the God of the fathers, the God of freedom and justice, familiar to nomadic tribes. Since this God had had different names with the various tribes, he coined a new common name. He called Him *Ehyeh* or *Ehveh,* that is to say, "I shall be (with you)." That was altered to YHWH, meaning, "He will be." It took some centuries until the Israelites became really familiar with this new name and called their children with compounds of YHWH.

Moses' work of liberation and unification required superhuman energy. Together with the Israelites many other slaves had escaped and joined them. The people could not appreciate freedom and preferred the security of slavery to the insecurity of the free wilderness. To keep them together Moses had to use all available means of persuasion and coercion. Naturally, he often lost his temper. With the greatest of energy and even severity he had to curb the rebellious spirit. The Biblical tradition relates that the people were almost ready to stone him. When he was absent, they made up for his all-too strict and rational authority by letting off steam in licentious feasts. The tradition also reports that there were only two leaders who were loyal to him: Joshua and Caleb. It is well to remember that the prophets before Jeremiah never mention the name of Moses. A tradition tells us that Moses could not enter Canaan because he had beaten and not spoken to "the rocks." That may be a mild form of speech, the word "rocks" being intended to denote "the people." He died a lonely man. Nobody knew his grave.

When the prophet Nathan, a man of great tenderness and love (2 Sam. 12.3.25), wrote down, in the days of David, the first document of Israel's history, he drew Moses according to his own human and national ideal. Thus he created the sympathetic Moses whom we all love. And it was this Moses, who became the "father of the prophets." It took a long time for Israel to realize that this lonely man by his indefatigable energy, his bold faith and his admirable courage was the real founder of Israel, its nationhood and its religion.

REVOLUTION AND COUNTER REVOLUTION IN POLAND

"The Pole, vicious dog that he is. He takes the Jew and tears out his beard, the cur! And now the vicious dog is getting a beating himself. That's fine, that's—Revolution. And then those who have given the Pole a beating say to me: 'Turn your gramophone over to us, Gedali, we're going to register it'. 'But I love music, madam,' I say to the Revolution. 'You don't know what you love, Gedali; I'm going to shoot you, and then you'll know. And I can't help shooting because I am the Revolution.'

"She can't help shooting, Gedali," I say to the old man, "because she is the Revolution."

"But the Pole did his shooting, kind sir, because he was the Counterrevolution; you shoot because you are the Revolution. But surely the Revolution is joy. And joy doesn't like orphans in the house. Good deeds are done by good men. But good men do not kill. So it is bad men that are making the Revolution. But Poles, too, are bad men. Who, then, will tell Gedali which is Revolution and which is Counterrevolution."

Isaak Babel, in *Benya Krik The Gangster,* published by Schocken Library, New York

Reinterpreting Protestant Doctrine in Justice to the Jews

By KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

THE centuries have fixed a deep gulf between Christianity and Judaism, between Church and Synagogue, between the people of the Torah and the people of the New Testament, and these centuries have seen only few and weak efforts at bridging this gulf. True, the Christian has always been quite willing to throw a bridge across the widening chasm. But his bridge has always been a one-way affair, designed to make it easier for the Jew to cross over, i.e., to be converted. Little wonder then that the Jew has grown increasingly suspicious of both bridges and bridge-builders and has preferred to remain on his own side.

Dr. A. Roy Eckhardt, Assistant Professor of the Philosophy of Religion at Lawrence College, has tried in his book, "Christianity and the Children of Israel,"* to construct a two-way bridge over the deep gulf of misunderstanding and hostility that for so long has kept Christians and Jews apart and that, especially during these past years, has revealed the unspeakable horrors and brutalities to which a centuries-old estrangement of two world-religions may lead. It seems strange indeed that even Hitler's anti-Jewish mania should have done so little to rouse the Christian world to a new sense of responsibility towards its Jewish neighbor and that this book by a Methodist theologian and philosopher should be the first bold and honest attempt on the part of a Christian leader to give a clear and authentic answer to the heart-rending "why?" of the Christian-Jewish tragedy.

Religious Foundations of the Churches' Injustice to Jews

Dr. Eckhardt approaches the Christian-Jewish dilemma forthrightly at that point where it is not only most personal and delicate but also most basic and disturbing, i.e., at its religious foundations. He is, of course, fully aware of those absolute demands Christianity has made throughout the ages on the basis of its claim to be the one genuine and ultimate revelation of "true religion." That claim finds its New Testament documentation in such passages as "in none other is there salvation, for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved," or "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself . . . and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation." The claim is elaborated in those patterns of doctrinal theology and religious practice that to this day confront the world with the challenge that "only Christ can save the world," that only they that confess Jesus as "Lord and God" may participate in movements of Christian fellowship and aspire to the full stature of "children of God." The Christian claim to uniqueness and final authority has only recently found this revealing expression from the pen of a distinguished Christian journalist who writes of "the Christian claim that once, and once for all, at a definite moment in the distant past, there emerged the ultimate criterion by which all history and all human achievement must evermore be judged. Christianity makes no less a claim than

* *Christianity and the Children of Israel,* by A. Roy Eckhardt. Kings Crown Press, New York. 1948. 223 pp. $3.00.

this for the historical person of Jesus Christ." And speaking of the center of the historic process as being "nothing else than God and His will for man," this writer goes on to say, "as Christians, we are left in no doubt concerning the precise location of this center of history. It is marked by the historical figure of Jesus Christ, in whom the living God definitely unveiled His presence and His character with irresistible authenticity."

Dr. Eckhardt brings to the writing of his book a wealth of scholarship, historical, philosophical, and theological; and, what is so very important in the treatment of such fundamentally controversial issues, he writes in a kindly and irenic spirit that might be more often employed by the members of his profession. He fully realizes the significance of that Christian absolutism which confronts a non-Christian world with the claims of a unique revelation, a unique church, a unique Bible, and a unique person, and he also recognizes what measure of misery and misfortune this claim has involved for the people of Israel. He argues from the premises of Protestant neo-Reformation thought and speaks in terms of that "confessional Protestantism" which those acquainted with recent movements in the world of Protestant ideology will equate with the writings and teachings of such contemporary Protestant leaders as Barth, Brunner, Tillich, the two Niebuhrs, Keller and others. He also employs the term "neo-Reformation relativism" to describe a point of view of the great Protestant theologians just named, a term that I find leads less to clarity than to confusion.

The Three Absolutes Responsible for the Church's Traditional Hostility

Chapters I and II are respectively titled "The Jewish Plight" and "The Jewish Plight: A Christian Interpretation," and they discuss the history of anti-Semitism, its causes, some solutions and their limitations, the latter chapter dealing with such subjects as "The Mystery of the Chosen People," "Original Sin and Anti-Semitism," and "God, Christ and *Judenhasz.*" In Chapter III, "Religious Absolutism and the Jews," the author comes to grips with the basic issues implicit in the absolutist claims of historic Christianity, and I find this chapter one of the most enlightening and informative in the whole book. It is both stimulating and refreshing to have a Christian theologian challenge so boldly and provocatively the three fundamental "absolutisms" of the Church that have been so fruitful a soil for the sowing of the dragon-teeth of Anti-Semitism. Dr. Eckhardt correctly assumes that any ecclesiastical absolutism elevating a church to a position of final and ultimate authority, any biblical absolutism making of a bible the sole and infallible authority for faith and life, or any Christological absolutism exalting the person of Jesus to the rank of Godhead and demanding acceptance of his person and word as sole condition for salvation, is bound to snarl the whole question of Jewish-Christian relations. For all of these absolutisms inevitably lead to a spiritual pride and to an attitude which, all its apparent dedication to "charity and brotherhood" notwithstanding, must consign Judaism to the status of an inferior religion and the people of Israel to that of "a people accursed and rejected of God."

The author says of Roman Catholicism, "by its equating of a given historical reality, the church, with ultimate truth, Roman Catholicism comes under our category of religious absolutism. According to its official (papal) pronouncements, the Catholic Church is a perfect society established by Christ, and custodian of all truth He taught." And again

he says, "the treatment of the Jews by the Church historically has flowed logically from the above theological presupposition," and he quotes the following from an authorized Catholic periodical: "Keeping in mind the Church's position, we see that the (medieval) Church acted consistently in saying to the Jew, 'you are an alien in a completely Christian framework; if you stay, it is on our terms; if you feel that your cultural development is impeded, you may either be baptized or leave; but these restrictions are for the safeguard of the majority and must be enforced.'"

Modern Protestantism, as Dr. Eckardt then shows, makes the Bible its absolute, and from this point of view arrives at a position towards the Jew that fundamentally varies little from that of Rome, except, of course, that for biblical, orthodox Protestantism, "salvation" for the Jew depends upon his conversion to a "Protestant" faith that can defend its position as "the true church" by invoking the infallible authority of an infallible book.

"Neo-Reformation theology," says the author, "finds its one Absolute in the conviction—shared with both Catholicism and fundamentalism — that Jesus is 'Christ' or 'Lord'." For the further enlightenment of his readers, especially the non-Christian readers, Dr. Eckardt might have added by way of explanation that the terms "Christ" and "Lord," when applied to Jesus of Nazareth, mean in simple English that "Jesus is God" in the sense in which the ancient and still authoritative ecumenical creeds of the church, especially the Nicene and the Athanasian creeds and later theological interpretations, declare and elaborate this dogma. And I might here remind my readers that the World Council of Churches, which this summer has held a great ecumenical conference in Amsterdam and there discussed as one of the major "concerns" of the church the topic "The Christian Attitude to the Jew," makes just this doctrinal test the condition for admission to its ranks. Unitarians, for instance, and other "liberal" Christians, who deny all and any of these "absolutisms" commonly held by the traditional churches, are excluded from this allegedly ecumenical" fellowship precisely because of their refusal to "sign on the dotted line" of a Christological absolutism.

Dr. Eckardt's Attempt to Reconcile Absolutism and Relativism

Chapter IV, "Religious Relativism and the Jews" is to my mind the most fascinating portion of the book; it is also, to this humble and not-so-bright parson, the most confusing. I find it just a bit too much of an intellectual effort to follow Dr. Eckardt's clever attempt at building a bridge from absolutism to relavitism, which, with the aid of many and allegedly apt quotations from the writings of the afore-mentioned great figures in neo-Protestantism, he appears to do with such apparent ease and *sans peine.* I quote the opening declaration of this chapter: "Religious relativism denies that a particular historical reality or point of view, as for example the Christian religion, is synonymous with ultimate truth or possesses exclusive validity. This denial is found both in Christian liberalism and in neo-Reformation theology." (sic!)

As a "Religious liberal" rather than a "Christian liberal," I find much that is familiar and attractive in this chapter;. but for the life of me I cannot help but feel that absolutism and relativism when presented as a sort of neo-Reformation Siamese Twins are hardly convincing. Dr. Eckhardt's "relativism," for all its pro-

undity and philosophical learning, seems to me much like a Procrustes-bed which one uses to adapt certain truths to one's own dimensions by conveniently stretching or shortening them. I also find it difficult to account for the author's frequent sniping at the "liberal," when so obviously throughout the book the best arguments employed so plainly show their "liberal" bent. Sometimes his unkind reflections upon liberalism are just childish and ill-tempered, as, for instance, when he states that "liberal thinking sees implicit anti-Semitism in the view that Christianity is superior to Judaism" and then challenges the liberal to account for the fact that during the war orthodox Protestant ministers came to the aid of their Jewish neighbors, even going so far as to display the Star of David and to risk their lives giving food and shelter to their persecuted Jewish fellow-citizens. Now, the liberal refuses to be "stumped" by so silly a challenge. He knows that such evidence of Christian decency and charity appeared not only among orthodox Protestants but also among Roman Catholics, and his explanation of this phenomenon, if one is needed, is simply this, that among all "orthodox believers," be they Protestant, Catholic or what have you, there are always men and women whose heart is bigger than their head, whose deeds are superior to their creeds, and whose ethic outruns their theology. Thank God for the fact that so many "orthodox" folks are infinitely better than their "orthodoxy"!

In the sub-chapter "Dilemma of the Missionary," we are again confronted with quotations and conclusions that often leave us gasping for the fresh air of simplicity and directness as we seek a way through the swamps of paradox and the fogs of that particular type of reasoning that many of us have come to associate with the "special" style of "neo-dialectic" or "neo-Reformation" logic. Who was it that said: "there are certain thinkers that go down farther, stay under longer, and come up muddier than any others"? I refer to such statements as "our primary concern is conversion to God and not conversion to Christianity (or Judaism)," a sentence ascribed to H. R. Niebuhr; or "as against Christian liberalism, neo-Reformation theology is absolute at the point of affirming that Jesus is the Christ. It would seem that to surrender this affirmation is to surrender the whole Christian faith"; or "in the light of a distinction between conversion to Christ and conversion to Christianity we have the genesis of a view which attempts to draw from the insights of both religious absolutism and religious relativism." Now, I maintain that such statements may make some sense for technically trained theologians and philosophers—or do they?—they certainly make little or no sense to those most concerned with the problem of anti-Semitism in its manifold ramifications, i.e., the people in the churches. I wonder just how far these views, if ever they could be made palatable and intellectually digestible to the rank and file of Christian believers, would find acceptance among them, and how their authors would fare were they to express such sentiments on the floor of their church or missionary conferences. It was at this point in the book that I began to wonder to just what extent the problem of Christian-Jewish relations is amenable to solution or even clarification by resorting to the sort of high-brow "dialectics" here employed.

These strictures are not meant to blind the reader to the many excellent arguments in even this chapter, and I should here add that the finest and most convincing portions of Dr. Eckardt's book are precisely those that set forth the lib-

eral point of view, whether the author is aware of this or not. It is therefore the more confusing to observe his at times almost painful efforts to avoid a too obvious identification with the position of "liberalism" and to cloak his argument in paradoxes that leave the reader pretty much "up in the air." Dr. Eckardt is at heart a "liberal," I believe, but he struggles manfully to make it clear that he is, after all, a "neo-Reformation Protestant," whatever that is. His position, shifting from adherence to a "confessional" type of "absolutism" to a profession of "neo-dialectic" (sic!) "relativism" too often leaves him hanging rather helplessly on the horns of a self-made dilemma and commits him to statements that in their over-simplification are neither clear nor convincing.

So, in the chapter "The Fight Against Anti-Semitism," we are told that "the only way for the ministry of the Church to proclaim the gospel of Christ, especially in the presence of the Jews, is to supplement the doctrine of justification by faith in Christ with a confession of personal sin." What a delightful over-simplification of the problem! But the author forgets that the Jew feels no need for the gospel of Christ, with or without the doctrine of justification by faith, and may be little impressed with either Christian msisionary fervor or attempts at fighting anti-Semitism "in the spirit of the gospel," even where these are accompanied by "a confession of personal sin" or the consciousness of "being under the judgment of God." There is much to be said for the statement "when Christians employ the symbol 'Christ' in the presence of the Jews, they must always accompany their confession by admitting their own sins and the collective sin of the Church for having time and again betrayed Christ before the Jews." But I very much doubt whether this frank "confession" is going to impress the Jew who recalls that throughout the ages the Church has not only preached "confession of sin," individual and corporate, but has also professed with ardor the brotherhood of man, all of which seems to have done precious little to prevent discrimination against and persecution of the Jew. And returning for a moment to the sentiment ascribed to Dr. H. R. Niebuhr to the effect that as missionaries "our primary concern is conversion to God and not conversion to Christianity," it takes neither wide nor profound knowledge of New Testament literature and theology to recognize that *Christianity* means first of all "faith in God who is not only 'in Christ', but who *is* Christ."

Evolution of Dr. Eckardt's Treatment of the Problem

The closing chapters, "Zionism and the Jews as an Ethnic Group," and "The Kingdom of God and History" are written in a fine spirit of deep understanding for Zionist aspirations and find their climax in paragraphs so "liberal" as to leave the reader wondering whether, after all, the writer did not have his tongue in his cheek when again and again he so gaily trounced "the liberals."

But even the closing paragraphs of the book cannot avoid that confusion and sophistication which appear throughout the entire volume and distract and annoy the reader. The tenor of Dr. Eckardt's final words is fundamentally tolerant, irenic, and friendly; but he *must* introduce again and again those paradoxes that have haunted him throughout these chapters and that—I believe I speak especially for the non-Christian reader—irritate and vex. He says, e.g., "A final problem for us is whether in being absolute at the point of affirming Jesus as the Christ we are not falling prey to a similar type of idolatry to that found in paganism. . . . Jewish theology has

ten expressed concern that Christian ith jeopardizes the unity of God. *A olytheistic Christianity would threaten e Hebrew-Christian tradition and could nceivably afford a disastrous theological sis for discrimination aaginst the Jews"* talics mine). Does this mean that r. Eckardt as a "confessional" Protes- nt, is willing to surrender the Deity of esus and to deny the Trinity? Obviously ot; he goes on to say, "The answer es in the fact that *Christian faith affirms historical reality as ultimate only to eny that it is ultimate"* (italics mine). nd this means what? To me it means his: that it takes more than Kierkegaar- ian paradox, Barthian orthodoxy, Til- ichian dialectic, and Niebuhrian pro- undity to make white plus black equal ed.

Contrast with this sophisticated dialec- ic the closing lines of the book: "It is uman arrogance to try to comprehend God by making final judgments concern- ing salvation. The Christian is not to exalt himself because he believes that Jesus is the Christ while some do not, neither is he to try to 'prove' that Chris- tianity is a 'better' religion than others; his true lot is simply to confess, with H. Richard Niebuhr, that 'Jesus Christ is the one who is reconciling us to God and that it is he whom we expect to triumph, not over the Jews so much as over our- selves."

Here you have the very essence of the spirit of this in many respects so remark- able book, the essence of earnest desire to be fair to the Jew while still remaining within the tradition of a Christianity which simply cannot refrain from voic- ing its pet "absolutism," viz., that "Jesus is he whom we expect to triumph, not over the Jews *so much* (just how much?) as over ourselves."

How well Dr. Eckardt has succeeded in building his two-way bridge between Christianity and Judaism, I leave for the reader to decide. I think he has done an excellent job in many ways; however, I also believe that his labors have left pretty well undisturbed some of the fun- damentals of anti-Semitism, viz., its pop- ular and folk aspects. This book is writ- ten in the mood and patois of the scholar, and there is little likelihood that its learned disquisitions will trickle down to the rank and file of Christians, and it is precisely here that Sunday School teach- ing, and preaching, and reading of the New Testament do their harm and cul- tivate that anti-Jewishness which so easily grows into *"Judenhasz,"* i.e., hatred of the Jew. Now that Dr. Eckardt has done so brave and good a job in attacking the theological foundations of anti-Semitism for the "upper crust," i.e., for theologians, preachers, philosophers, etc., let him bring his argument down to earth and tell the Christian in home and pew how to recon- cile his attitude to the Jew with the love and justice his faith requires of him.

It is a pity that this book so far seems to have aroused so little interest in the Christian world; even the "undenomina- tional" journal, *The Christian Century,* reviews it in a casual and off-hand man- ner. Because of its many excellent quali- ties and despite its many obvious short- comings I heartily recommend it as a text-book for Christian colleges and semi- naries and as excellent source material for adult classes as well as rabbi-minister discussion groups. The book is a path- finder and its author deserving of high praise.

Random Thoughts

Does Kol Nidre apply also to election year promises, or are they discounted even without Kol Nidre?

* * *

When Plato wanted to find out what constitutes a normal human being, he studied him in the magnified form of the state.

Nowadays, when a psychologist wants to find out what constitutes a normal human being, he has to study him in the exaggerated form of the neurotic.

* * *

Christian Neo-Orthodoxy may be said to aim at breaking man's will, out of a mistaken deference to God's will.

The result is likely to be an increase in man's willfulness.

* * *

Every new means to freedom is a new source of dependence.

* * *

The problem of how to spare an adopted child the shock which comes with learning the truth about its parentage was met by an ingenious mother in the following way:

"You know, my dear," she said, to her adopted daughter of seven, "you are a very lucky little girl. Other children are given to their parents who have to take them whether they want to or not. But you were selected by your father and me from a number of children, because we loved you."

All went well until about a year or so later when the mother became pregnant.

What was to happen to that ingenious explanation? And how was the adopted child to act toward the child that was about to come into the world?

Let those who insist on holding on to the doctrine of chosenness—be they Jews, Christians or Moslems—answer the question.

* * *

When man discovers that the same cause can result simultaneously in two contradictory effects, he rediscovers the freedom of the human will.

* * *

A concept of God is like an horizon at which the furthest reaches of our vision meet the infinite spaces beyond.

A concept of society corresponds to all of human life within the scope of our vision.

A concept of self is like the eye, which seeing all else, does not see itself.

* * *

In the *Sefer Hasidim* there is a story of a shepherd who was too ignorant to recite the prescribed prayers. But the yearning to pray was so strong in him that he could not help making up his own prayer.

"O God," he prayed, "you surely know that if you had sheep which you would want me to take care of, I would do it for you without pay."

If that prayer could be translated into pastoral theology, we would have more and better religion in the world.

* * *

The main reason so many of our people do not know what to be Jews for is that they have nothing to be Jews with.

* * *

When one gives us the cold shoulder, we get a touch of the horror of aloneness, with its chill of death.

* * *

Communism's promise of ultimate freedom after the transitional stage of class dictatorship tastes like warmed over "pie in the sky."

M. M. K.